



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/930,328

08/15/2001

Steven French

AUS920010290US1

1697

35525 7590 09/26/2007

IBM CORP (YA)  
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC  
P.O. BOX 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/26/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/930,328

Applicant(s)

FRENCH ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 18-31 and 35-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 18-31 and 35-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**Remarks**

Claims 1-14, 18-31, and 35-37 are pending.

**Response to Arguments**

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). For completeness, the following contains a response to applicant's argument. Applicant argues that Hougaard does not teach configuring a network device in accordance with geographical location information through a network administrative user interface. Applicant refers to page 90, line 21 through page 92, line 7 of the application's specification as providing examples of configuring network devices. The examiner cannot find any of these examples within that portion of the specification. In addition, examples of how something may work do not constitute a definition.

First, a description of a portion of the disclosure of Liming is provided. Liming teaches associating network devices with geographic locations, such association may involve a MAC address associated with latitudes and longitudes. Liming also teaches media, data, services, etc. that are dependent upon the location of the network devices (Paragraphs 73-78, for example). Liming also teaches configuring such network

Art Unit: 2137

devices (Paragraphs 84, 91, and 156-162, for example). Hougaard, column 7, lines 45-52 reads "The administrator can configure context filters 34, which permits the users to receive only the geographic and other data that is relevant to them at the time that the requests for data are made. The administrator can also configure user access filters 36, which constitute a security mechanism for allowing only authorized users to access the geographic and other data." Such configuration will be performed via the administrator application/interface, as described throughout Hougaard. When viewing such teaching within the combination, one will see that the combination clearly teaches configuring the network device in accordance with the geographic location information through a network administrative user interface.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14, 18-31, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liming (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0055924) in view of Hougaard (U.S. Patent 6,216,130).

Regarding Claim 1,

Liming discloses a method for management of a distributed data processing system, the method comprising:

Determining a unique network hardware identifier for a network device (Paragraphs 73-74; 99-100; and 156-159);

Associating the unique network hardware identifier with geographic location information (Paragraphs 73-74; 99-100; and 156-159); and

Managing the network in accordance with the geographic location information (Paragraphs 156-162);

But does not explicitly disclose configuring the network device in accordance with the geographic location information through a network administrative user interface.

Hougaard, however, configuring the network device in accordance with the geographic location information through a network administrative user interface (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; and Column 7, lines 1-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the geographic-based management system of Hougaard into the location-based network system of Liming in order to allow the system of organize geographic information located at remote sources in such a way that it is easily accessible and displayable to users, facilitate the exchange and distribution of geographic information to multiple users within an organization, and/or to allow an administrator to specify which users are authorized to access, modify, or delete geographic information through filters.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 35,

Claim 35 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Liming discloses that the unique network hardware identifier is a MAC address (Paragraphs 156-159).

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 36,

Claim 36 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Hougaard discloses authorizing user access to the network device based on a user security parameter corresponding to the geographic location information (Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 37,

Claim 37 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Liming discloses generating a unique name for an endpoint resource on the network device, wherein the unique name comprises the geographic location information (Paragraphs 88-90; 107-110; and 160-165).

Regarding Claim 21,

Claim 21 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Hougaard discloses associating the endpoint resource with security attributes for the endpoint resource (Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29).

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2137

Regarding Claim 6,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Liming discloses associating the unique name for the endpoint resource with the unique network hardware identifier (Paragraphs 88-90; 107-110; and 156-165).

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 7,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Liming discloses determining a router closest to the endpoint resource (Paragraphs 95-101; and 152-159);

Retrieving router geographic location information associated with the router (Paragraphs 95-101; and 152-159; and

Using the router geographic information in the generated unique name for the endpoint resource (Paragraphs 95-101; and 152-159).

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,



Art Unit: 2137

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Liming discloses determining a network address generator (NAG) for the endpoint resource (Paragraphs 52-55; and 165-167);

Retrieving NAG geographic location information associated with the NAG (Paragraphs 52-55; and 165-167); and

Using the NAG geographic location information in the generated unique name for the endpoint resource (Paragraphs 52-55; 95-101; 156-159; and 165-167).

Regarding Claim 25,

Claim 25 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 8, in addition, Liming discloses that the network address generator is a sever operating in accordance with a DHCP protocol (Paragraphs 52-55; and 165-167).

Regarding Claim 26,

Claim 26 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 10,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Liming discloses detecting a change of location of the network

device within the distributed data processing system based on the geographic location information (Paragraphs 91, 98-101, and 133); and Hougaard discloses detecting a change of location of the network device within the distributed data processing system based on the geographic location information (Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 8, line 53 to Column 9, line 23).

Regarding Claim 27,

Claim 27 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 11,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 10, in addition, Liming discloses reconfiguring the network device based on the detected change of location of the network device (Paragraphs 91, 98-101, and 133); and Hougaard discloses reconfiguring the network device based on the detected change of location of the network device (Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 8, line 53 to Column 9, line 23).

Regarding Claim 28,

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 11 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 12,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 10, in addition, Hougaard discloses reconfiguring user security parameters

based on the detected change of location of the network device (Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 8, line 53 to Column 9, line 23).

Regarding Claim 29,

Claim 29 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 12 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

Limiting as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Hougaard discloses representing the distributed data processing system as a set of scopes, wherein a scope comprises a logical organization of network-related objects (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21);

Associating each scope with a management customer, wherein each scope is uniquely assigned to a management customer, wherein each scope is uniquely associated with a set of configuration parameters for managing each scope (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21);

Managing the distributed data processing system as a set of logical networks, wherein a logical network comprises a set of scopes, and wherein each logical network is uniquely assigned to a management

Art Unit: 2137

customer (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21); and

Allowing an administrative user to dynamically reconfigure logical networks within the distributed data processing system (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21).

Regarding Claim 30,

Claim 30 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 13 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Liming as modified by Hougaard discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Hougaard discloses dynamically discovering endpoints, systems, and networks within the distributed data processing system (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21);

Correspondingly representing endpoints, systems, and networks within the distributed data processing system as a set of endpoint objects, system objects, and network objects (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21); and

Logically organizing the endpoint objects, system objects, and network objects within a set of scopes, wherein each endpoint object,

each system object, and each network object is uniquely assigned to a scope such that scopes do not logically overlap (Column 5, line 32 to Column 6, line 19; Column 7, line 1 to Column 8, line 29; and Column 10, line 1 to Column 11, line 21).

Regarding Claim 31,

Claim 31 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 14 and is rejected for the same reasons.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2137

  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER